



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIV, 3.

WHOLE NO. 135.

I.—NEVE AND NEQUE WITH THE IMPERATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE.¹

In previous numbers of the Journal² the earlier and the later use of these connectives, particularly in prohibitions, has been discussed. In this investigation the remaining uses of these two particles with the subjunctive have also been taken into consideration, and the usage of the intervening period examined, with the purpose of presenting a complete history of these connectives from the earliest times down to Apuleius. As these particles are particularly abundant in Cato's *Disticha*, this author was also included. For the usage of the earliest period I am indebted to Bennett's *Early Latin*, Vol. I, but the statements regarding the usage of the two following periods are based upon the writer's own collections, made from the latest Teubner texts and those in the Loeb Classical Series, so far as published. In the entire field examined one figure stands forth with prominence, Ovid, who is conspicuous above all others for the frequency with which he uses *neve* and *neque* and for the varied uses he makes of these connectives. Including both principal

¹ Schmalz, in 1907, in his *Antib. d. Lat. Spr.* II, p. 145, says: "Wünschenswert wäre eine Untersuchung über den Gebrauch von *neve* im Vergleich mit dem von *neque*," and Blase, in 1903, in *Hist. Gram. d. Lat. Spr.* II, 1, p. 198 f., had, in effect, expressed the same sentiment.

² Cf. Elmer, *A. J. P.* XV (1894), p. 299 f.; XXII (1901), p. 80 f.; Clement XXI (1900), p. 166 f.; XXII, p. 87 f. Cf. also Ashmore, *Proc. Amer. Phil. Assn.* 32 (1901), p. 85 f., and for Livy's usage, Lease, *Class. Phil.* III (1908), p. 302 f., and for the subject in general, Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*⁴ (1910), and Blase, *l. c.*

and subordinate clauses these particles were used by Ovid 370 times! Next to Ovid comes Cicero with 216 and Livy with 176, and next to these *sed longo intervallo* is Caesar and Tacitus, each with 51. It is a striking fact, but due, of course, to the character of the subject matter, that a writer of such scope as Plin. Mai. makes use of these connectives only 13 times, or as Varro (R. R., L. L.) only 7 times and Val. Max. only 6 times. It is to be noted, too, that in principal clauses some writers do not make use of them at all, as Varro (R. R., L. L.), Caesar, Nepos, Sen. Rhet., Vell., Val. Max., Gaius and Gellius, but it is in principal clauses that their use is most common in poetry, as Vergil, 28 princ., 6 sub.; Mart., 33-5; Sil., 17-3. In contrast to this stands the usage of Cicero with only 26 princ. to 200 sub. and Livy with 21-155.

Any discussion of the use of the connectives *neve* and *neque* properly takes as its starting point the fact that the regular negative with both the imperative and subjunctive is *ne*. When the need arose to add a negative clause with these moods, *et ne* would naturally suggest itself, with a possible *ac ne* or *—que ne*, depending upon the character of the connection. None of these connectives, however, became the form in common use, but logically they deserve attention by way of introduction to the discussion which follows, as well as for the reason that hitherto they have not received adequate treatment.

A. ET NE.

I. PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

a) *Imperative*: Catull. 62. 59 *Et ne pugna*; Verg. Aen. 10. 599, Val. Fl. 8. 436, Stat. Ach. 1. 534. Compare *Neve* p. 262 B. In Orat. Obliq., cf. Tac. Hist. 4. 14 for *et ne* and for *neve* or *neque* p. 267.

b) *Subjunctive*: Cato Agr. 113. 2 *ne accedat et ne siveris*, Ter. Eun. 77 *et ne adflites neque addas*, Lucr. 1. 1103 *ne . . . et ne . . . neve*, Ovid Pont. 1. 2. 113, Val. Fl. 4. 37, Apul. Phil. 78. 12 (*Th.*). Note Ps. Quint. Decl. 88. 6 *et ne putassis*; 69. 7.

2. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

a) *Et ne . . . , indic.*, or jussive sub.: Ovid Ibis 245 *Et ne diceret, dixit*; Tr. 4. 6. 12; 235, Tac. Ann. 1. 60; 3. 67; 4. 6 *Et ne . . . utque*; Just. 2. 4. 7; 29. 1. 7; Apul. Met. 256. 1 (*H.*), and after a question, Livy 40. 14. 5.

b) *et ne* (i. e. not after a period): Livy 1. 42. 1 *munire et ne esset*, iungit, and so 3. 53. 4; 8. 16. 5, Cic. Verr. 1. 24, Cels. 57. 37, Sen. N. Q. IV, *pr.* 20, Curt. 5. 12. 20, Plin. Mai. 17. 266, Quint. 11. 3. 176, Tac. Ann. 14. 3; 15. 9, Plin. Pan. 83. 4, Just. 2. 4. 13; 5. 8. 2; 8. 3. 13; 35. 1. 6, Apul. Met. 109. 15; in poetry Ovid Met. [7. 340]; 11. 695; 14. 186, A. A. 2. 393, Rem. Am. 465, Ibis 235; 245, Trist. 4. 6. 12. Cf. Cato Agr. 46. 1 *et uti ne . . . , vertito.*

c) *ut . . et ne*: Cato Agr. 32. 1 (cf. 1. 1 *uti ne . . neve . . et ne*) 137. 1, Sen. Suas. 1. 13, Suet. Aug. 35. 3 *ut . . et ne . . neve.* Cf. Cic. De Or. 1. 132 *ut . . et ut ne*, Flor. 2. 19. 5; *quo . . et ne*, Cic. Att. 13. 11. 1 *ut et . . et ne.*

d) *ne . . et ne*: Cato Agr. 32. 2; Cic. Verr. 1. 24, Off. 1. 89; 129; Sen. Dial. 4. 18. 1; Ben. 5. 22. 2; Quint. 8. 5. 7; Suet. Claud. 35. 2. Cf. Livy 43. 2. 12 *ne . . neve . . et ne.*

e) *et ne . . non*: Cic. Fam. 14. 18. 2 *videte et ne . . non liceat.*

B. —QUE NE.

Tib. 1. 6. 19 *neu decipiat digitoque ne trahat et ducat*, Val. Fl. 4. 125 *Nec det —que ne crede*; 2. 5 *sinit ne . . . — que ne deserat*; 7. 80 *contremuit ne . . segue ne putes.*

C. AC NE.¹

1. PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

a) *Imperative*: to the two passages cited by the Thes. Ling. Lat. col. 1075 (Plaut. As. 462, Sil. 15. 160) add:

Sil. 17. 445 state *ac ne* prodite, Val. Fl. 4. 159 *consulite atque² . . . ne* temnite, and Stat. Theb. 15. 161 *da ac ne sperne.*

b) *Subjunctive*: Cic. Att. 2. 24. 1 *Ac ne sis perturbatus*, Plin. Mai. 17. 25 *tondeantur ac ne radantur.*

2. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. The most common variety, in anticipating an objection, is treated first.

a) *Ac ne . . .* indic. Cicero=19 (Verr. 3. 108; 181, Balb. 44, Cluent. 107, Scaur. 7, Cat. 3. 10, Arch. 1. 2, Phil. 3. 24, Rep. 6. 12, De Or. 1. 8; 34; 2. 191; 235, Fam. 5. 7. 3; 12. 9; 7. 26. 2, Att. 1. 11. 1; 2. 18. 2; 8. 3. 7 (De Or. 1. 8. *Ac ne . . concedat*), Bell. Alex. 58. 1,

¹ The treatment of *ac ne* in the Thes. Ling. Lat. is far from being adequate.

² It may be noted that the formula *atque ne* was not used, tho *atque non* was occasionally found. Cf. Lease, A. J. P. XXX (1909), p. 298, note 3.

Nepos = 2 (Att. 2. 3; 10. 4), Celsus 327. 23, Val. Max. = 4 (3. 2; 4. 3 ext. 1; 4. 5. 4; 5. 3 ext. 1), Curt. = 2 (3. 2. 15; 8. 9. 29), Petron. = 2 (27; 127), Plin. Mai. = 4 (10. 82; 14. 52; 20. 50; 28. 40), Quint. 4. 1. 69, Tac. = 10 (Hist. 1. 18; 38; 55; 3. 5, Ann. 4. 41; 6. 19; 11. 19; 33; 12. 60; 13. 18), Suet. = 7 (Aug. 84, Cal. 37. 3; 41. 1, Claud. 15. 4, Nero 23. 1; 24. 1; 38. 3 ac ne non), Just. = 2 (38. 2. 7; 4. 13), Apul. = 2 (Met. 291. 15, Phil. 20. 1). This usage is more common in prose (55) than in poetry (7). Its frequency in Cicero (19) and in Tac. (10) is to be noted. Poetry: Hor. C. 1. 18. 7, Ep. 1. 1. 13; 18. 58; 19. 26; 2. 1. 208, Lucan. 4. 141; 7. 797; i. e. only in two poets.

b) *ac ne* . . . indicative: (Lex Anton., of 71 B. C. (Schn. 309) *ac ne locentur, sancitum est*), Cic. Att. 6. 9. 1 (Ellipsis), Livy 30. 18. 3, Celsus 270. 19, Val. Max. = 3 (2. 1. 10; 2. 7. 7; 4. 1. 14); Curt. 5. 2. 2, Plin. Mai. = 7 (5. 55; 7. 164; 9. 32; 169; 13. 22; 18. 251; 291), Tac. = 5 (4. 2. 29; 319, Ann. 12. 5; 15. 64; 16. 7), Suet. = 4 (Iul. 41. 3, Aug. 38. 2; 40. 2, Nero 37. 2). In prose this usage is found 23 times; in poetry only 3 times (Verg. Ecl. 3. 4, Calp. Ecl. 3. 33, Stab. Theb. 6. 926); cf. also Verg. Geo. 3. 70 . . . imperative, and is most common in Plin. Mai. (7) and Tac. (5).

c) *ut . . ac ne*: Val. Max. 9. 1 ext. 2, Quint. 1. 4. 16, Suet. Cal. 14. 1, Nero 17; 32. 2. Cf. Plaut. Amph. 126 *ut . . atque ut ne*.

d) *ne . . ac ne*: Cic. De Or. 1. 166 *recusaret ne caderet ac ne liberaretur*;¹ Livy 4. 7. 6 *ne qua . . ac ne*, Tac. Ann. 15. 19 *ne . . ac ne quidem*.

e) *Inconcinnity*: Tac. Hist. 2. 34 *transitum simulantes ac ne terreret*; 3. 46 *victoriae ignarus ac ne ingrueret*; Suet. Iul. 88 *placuit nominari ac ne ageretur*.

D. ET NON, —QUE NON, AC NON.

Instead of *ne* with these moods one sometimes finds *non*.² (With an imperative *non* is exceedingly rare, being found, in

¹ Draeger H. S. II,² p. 696, and Schmalz Synt.⁴, p. 280, say that this usage begins in Silver Latin.

² For *non* with the subjunctive cf. Draeger H. S. I², p. 312, Blase H. G. III, pp. 136, 155, 233, and Schmalz Synt.⁴, p. 478. To the lists in Blase for *utinam non* with the pres. add: Ovid Pont. 1. 2. 108, Mart. I Praef., Quint. 2. 5. 17; for plpf.: Ovid Pont. 1. 5. 28, Ps. Cic. ad Oct. 8; for impf.: Quint., 1. 2. 6.

fact, according to Schmalz Synt.⁴, p. 220, only three times (Cat. 66, 80, Ovid Ep. 16. 164, A. A. 3. 129). But at least three more are to be added: Ovid Pont. 1. 2. 105 *non* petito, Trist. 5. 5. 63 *non* parcite, and Cato Dist. 4. 6 *non* suggere. If, however, Cat. 66. 80, *non prius* tradite, cited also by Blase H. G. III, p. 245, but not by Draeger H. S. I², p. 328, is to be regarded as a legitimate example, two others of like character are to be added: Sen. H. F. 585 and Calpurn. 5. 24. In these three passages, it is to be noted, *non* is closely connected with the adverb *prius* or *ante*). From the use of *non* would naturally develop the use of *et non* as a connective, independently of its use where *non* modifies a particular word.

Ovid Tr. 5. 17. 23 *utinam vivat et non moriatur*, and so Juv. 16. 27; Ovid Pont. 3. 1. 165 *utinam sint tuasque non aspiciant*; Apul. Flor. 24. 26 (*H.*) *utinam suppeteret ac non clauderet*. Cf. Apul. Met. 111. 11 *non parentibus ac nec ulli monstremus nec quicquam norimus*, and Livy 5. 5. 11 *ut nec . . . et non*.

E. NON . . . NEC.

To the three occurrences cited by Draeger H. S. I², p. 312 (Sen. Ben. 7. 16. 4; 23. 2, and Claud. 14) add: Sen. Ep. 103. 5 *non abhorreat nec agat*; Thy. 185; Lucan. 7. 320; 8. 738, Quint. 2. 1. 5; 6. 1. 29; Juv. 11, 186; Sen. Dial. 9. 35, two pfs.; Pers. 1. 7, Mart. 5. 34. 9 pres. and pf. Cf. also Val. Fl. 5. 57 *non dividat ossaque nec tumulo nec separe contegat*; Juv. 6. 448 *non . . . nec . . . et non*; Tac. Dial. 13 *non . . . nec . . . nec . . . et nec . . . nec*, Plaut. Trin. 133 *non redderes neque quicquam neque emeris neque venderes nec faceres*. Note also Ovid A. A. 3. 129 *non onerate nec prodite*, and Hor. Ep. 1. 1. 30.

F. NEC . . . NEU, ETC.

The use of various connectives in the same sentence is also to be noted (Livy 5. 51. 1 has *ut nec . . . et non*), as Ovid. Fast. 4. 921 *parce—que aufer neve noce. Nec amplectere*; Juv. 14. 201 *pares nec subeant neu credas* (cf. pp. 264 and 273); Cato Agr. 1. 1 *uti ne . . . neve . . . et ne*; Lucr. 1. 1105 *ne . . . et ne . . . neve*; Livy 43. 2. 12 *ne . . . neve . . . et ne*. Compare also Ovid Tr. 4. 6. 12 *et ne sint*, *cavet* with Met. 7. 137 *neve valeant, canit*.

G. UTQUE.

This connective deserves brief consideration. Tho not used by Cicero or Caesar (but in Bell. Hisp. 2. 2), it was frequently used by Ovid, as in Tr. 4. 1. 65, Her. 15. 119, etc. Compare *utque* venias, oro in Her. 5. 57 with *neu* deseret, oro in Met. 7. 850. Cf. also Tac. Hist. 3. 49. *Ut . . utque* is found in Verg. Aen. 2. 665, Hor. Sat. 1. 2. 39, Tib. 1. 7. 19, Ovid Tr. 5. 8. 37, Vell. 2. 16. 3, Suet. Claud. 12. 2; 22; *et ne . . utque* in Tac. Ann. 4. 6; *utque . . . nec* in Ovid Ibis 609.¹ But though *utque* and *nēque*, and *utve* and *nēve* were used, *nēque* was never developed, at least in poetry.

I. PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

I. *Imperative.*

From the earliest times down to Apuleius (excluding inscriptions) *neve* and *neque* are used with the imperative 183 times. Of these, it is to be noted, 179 are found in poetry and only 4 in prose (*nec* is used once by Cicero, once by Sen. Phil., and Cato uses *neve* and *neque* each once after *ne*). This usage is most common in Class. Latin (133) and Silver Latin (43), but rare in Early Latin (7). The unusually large number in Class. Lat. is due to the presence of Ovid. In this writer this form of expression is found more often, 116 times, than in any other. In fact, the nearest approach to Ovid was made by Statius with 16 and Vergil with 14. This is, of course, due to the more personal and didactic character of Ovid's poetry.

A. TWO IMPERATIVES = III.

This usage is more common in poetry (109) than in prose (2). In prose but one connective, *nec*, was used, and that by Cic. and Sen. Phil. In poetry, however, both particles were used, *neve* 24 times, *neu* 9, but *neque* 4 times, *nec* 72. The use of *neve* (*neu*) begins with Hor.² and next appears in Tib. (2), Ovid (17!), then in Sen. (4), Luc., Pers., Val. Fl. (2), Sil., Stat. (3), Cato; of *neque* (*nec*) with App. Claud., Plaut., Lucil.; Catull., Cic., Verg. (2), Hor. (2), Prop. (3), Ovid (48!); Sen. (3), Calp. (2),

¹ It may be here added that later Amm. Marc. uses *utque* 10 times: 17. 4. 7: 20. 4. 13: 8. 21; 9. 5; 11. 20: 28. 2. 5: 6. 7; 18: 30. 2. 11: 7. 7.

² The name alone means that the usage is found but once in that writer.

Val. Fl. (2), Stat. (7), Mart. (2). It is to be noted that of the 33 occurrences of *neve* (neu) Ovid alone furnishes over half (17), of the 76 occurrences of *neque* (nec) the same poet furnishes 48; that *neve* (neu) was not used in prose, and that in all, *neve* (neu) was used 33 times, *neque* (nec) 78. In regard to the form of the connective that was used, it may be stated that in the case of *neve* the longer form was preferred (24-9), but in the case of *neque* the shorter (74-4). This preference for *nec* is to be accounted for not only by metrical considerations, but also by the general tendency toward the use of the shorter form, of *nec* rather than *neque*, of *ac* rather than *atque*, etc.¹ For the pres. subj. cf. p. 275.

1) EARLY LATIN = 3 *neque* (nec), (*neve* (neu), found only in inscriptions): App. Claud. (p. 36, *B.*) obliscere nec aequae, Plaut. Poen. 1129 mirari noli neque contemplier, Lucil. (581 *B.*) persta nec transi vel da.

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 77 (*neve* (neu) = 20, *neque* (nec) = 57).

a) *Neve* (neu) = 20 (neu = 4),² all in poetry: Hor. Ep. 1. 11. 23 *sume neu differe*, Tib. 1. 8. 49 *utere. Neu torque*; 3. 10. 11 *veni: neu torque*, and 17 times in Ovid (neu = 1, Pont. 4. 16. 48); Rem. 689 (—to). Her. 11. 126; 17. 112, Met. 4. 223; 491; 9. 563; 10. 546; 13. 748; 15. 777, Trist. 1. 2. 3; 1. 5. 37; 3. 1. 3; 3. 4. 76; 4. 4. 41, Pont. 1. 8. 1, Fast. 4. 922 (for Fast. 1. 288, see Part II, E, a). Note Her. 17. 112 *desine neve nosce, sed sine nec habe*.

b) *Neque* (nec) = 57 (nec = 54).

In prose this construction is found only once, Cic. Att. 12. 22. 3 *habe nec existima* (for Servius (Cic. Fam. 4. 5. 5) see crit. note). In poetry (*neque* = 3, *nec* = 53); Cat. 8. 10 *noli nec sectare, nec vive*; Verg. G. 3. 96; A. 3. 394 *teneto, nec horresce*; Hor. C. 2. 7. 19; 3. 7. 29 (*neque*), Prop. 3. 10. 16; 4. 7. 87; 11. 89 and 48 times³ in Ovid; Am. 3. 2. 24; 3. 4. 44, Her. 3. 91; 138; 11. 60; 16. 11; 195; 17. 114, A. A. 1. 77; 394; 2; 211; 224; 313; 3. 131. 238. 486. 553. 756, Rem. 93, Met. 1. 462;

¹ Cf. Lease, Class. Phil. III (1908), p. 304 f., Class. Rev. XVI (1902), p. 313 f., A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 39 f.

² Cf. Draeger H. S. I,² p. 328, Schmalz Anm. 496 to Reisig Vorles., and Blase, H. S. III, p. 245. In these, however, the lists of occurrences are far from complete.

³ Draeger, l. c., cites only 7 occurrences in Ovid.

2. 464; 3. 477; 5. 281; 8. 93; 433-551; 9. 122. 792; 11. 669; 13. 839; 14. 376, Trist. 1. 1. 59; 1. 9. 65; 2. 181; 3. 3. 51; 5. 6. 46 (*neque*), Pont. 1. 9. 24; 2. 2. 7; 2. 2. 42; 2. 7. 83 (*neque*), 3. 1. 147, Fast. 2. 174; 675; 3. 497; 829; 4. 526; 5. 412; 6. 380.

Note the use of the fut. and pres. imperative side by side: Ovid A. A. 3. 238 *caveto nec resolve*; Met. 1. 462 *esto nec asserere*. Cf. Rem. 689 *crede neve caveto*, and Am. 1. 8. 85 *faciant nec timeto*.

3. SILVER LATIN = 31 (*neve* = 8, *neu* = 5, *neque* = 0, *nec* = 18). In the prose of this period this construction was found but once, with *nec* (Sen. Ep. 59. 1).

a) *Neve* (*neu*) = 13 (*neu* 5): Sen. H. F. 655, Phaed. 131, Oct. 254, 271, Lucan 2, 39, Pers. 6. 66 (*neu*), Val. Fl. 6. 539 (*neu*), 7. 225, Sil. 12. 329 (*neu*), Stat. Ach. 1. 357, Theb. 8. 94; 328 (*neu*), Cato Dist. 1. 2 (*neu*).

b) *Neque* (*nec*) = 18 (*neque* = 0): in prose, Sen. Ep. 59. 1; in poetry: Sen. Troad. 710, Med. 605, Calpurn. 7. 19; 57, Val. Fl. 1. 525; 4. 251, Sil. 17, 29; 15. 191, Stat. Silv. 2. 2. 141; 4. 1. 29, Ach. 1. 941, Theb. 2. 118; 4. 4. 80; 6. 174; 12. 816, Mart. 4. 14. 11; 7. 93. 7.

B. AFTER A PERIOD = 26.

The use of *neve* or *neque* with an imperative to begin a new sentence belongs exclusively to poetry. It is to be noted that *neve* and *neu* were each used twice in this way, but that *neque* was not used at all, and *nec* 22 times. *Neve* begins with Plautus, and is later used by Ovid (2), and Dorcatius; *neque*, with Verg. (1), Tib. (2), Ovid (15!), and is later found in Lucan, Val. Fl., Sil., and Mart.

1) EARLY LATIN = 1 (*neu*).

Plaut. Merc. 1021 *Neu quisquam prohibeto*.

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 21 (*neve* = 2, *neu* = 1, *neque* = 0, *nec* 18).

a) *Neve* (*neu*) = 3 (*neu* = 1): Ovid Met. 11. 136, Tr. 4. 4. 41, and *Neu*: Dorcatius, p. 357 (*B.*). Cf. Verg. A. 8. 40 *neu terrere*, after a semicolon, and *Et ne*, p. 256.

b) *Neque* (*nec*) = 18 (only *nec*): Verg. A. 3. 394, Tib. 1. 4. 21; 1. 8. 27, and 15 in Ovid: Am. 1. 11. 19 (—to), Her. 5. 87; 99; 16. 31; 339; 17. 171, Med. Fac. 69, A. A. 1. 631; 2. 215; 533; 3. 783; 807, Pont. 3. 1. 89, Fast. 6. 291; 923; and two after

a colon, Her. 17. 129, Met. 13. 623, one after a question, Verg. G. 2. 96. Cf. p. 271, l. 3.

3) SILVER LATIN = 4 (only *nec*): Val. Fl. 4. 477; 5. 502, Sil. 3. 146, Mart. 3. 2. 12. After a semicolon, Val. Fl. 4. 603, Stat. Silv. 1. 4. 34, Theb. 9. 659; after a question, Lucan 9. 1081, and in a parenthesis, Stat. Theb. 3. 714.

C. AFTER A SUBJUNCTIVE = 5.

This construction (e. g. *sim nec puta*) is only found in Ovid: Am. 1. 8. 85 (—to), Her. 3. 91, A. A. 1. 440; 3. 272, Met. 10. 302.

D. AFTER AN INDICATIVE = 1.

Stat. Theb. 12. 594 *adsum nec crede*. Cf. p. 272.

E. NEVE . . NEVE AND NEQUE . . . NEQUE.

Neve . . neve was not so common (4) as *neque . . neque* (11). Neither combination is found in prose. The former was used by Verg. (2), Tib., and Sil., the latter by Ovid (9), Tib., Hor. and Mart. (*Nec ter* and *nec sept.* are found in Ovid).

1) EARLY LATIN = 0.

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 14.

a) *Neve—neve* = 3: Verg. G. 4. 47 *neu sine neve ure neu crede*; 2. 299 *Neve vergant neve sere neve pete neu laede neve insere*; Tib. 1. 2. 35 *neu tenete neu quaerite neu ferte*.

b) *Neque . . . neque* = 11.

1) *With two imperatives* = 7 (*neque* = 2): Ovid Am. 1. 13. 21 *nec consulto nec diserto*; Her. 13, 204, A. A. 2. 595, Met. 2. 135, Rem. 693, A. A. 3. 475 *neque . . nec*, Hor. C. 1. 9. 15 *nec . . neque*.

2) *With imper. and subj.* = 4; Tib. 1. 1. 38 (*neu . . nec*, Postgate), Ovid A. A. 1. 75, Am. 1. 8. 63 (note 2. 2. 25 *nec quaesiveris nec time*), Met. 8. 433. (*Nec . . nec . . nec*; Ovid Am. 1. 4. 43 (3 imps.), 15. 475 (4 imps.), Am. 1. 4. 35, Rem. 587, Rem. 219 (*nec sept.*).

3) SILVER LATIN = 2.

Neu . . neu: Sil. 2. 700; *nec . . nec*: Mart. 13. 110 (cf. 5. 8. 47, text). Cf. Livy 38. 38. 8, an early treaty).

F. NE . . NEVE AND NE . . NEQUE.

In prose, *ne . . neve* and *ne . . neque* are each used but once, and by one author, Cato. In poetry *ne . . neve* is used 12 times,

by Plaut., Verg. (7), Ovid, Sen. (2), Stat., but *ne . . nec* 3 times, Ovid (2), Stat.

1) EARLY LATIN = 3.

a) *Ne . . neve* (neu) = 2; Cato Agr. 144. 1 (—to). Plaut. Stich. 20 *ne lacruma neu fac*.

b) *Ne . . neque* = 1: Cato Agr. 145 *oleum ne tangito utendi causa neque furandi causa*.

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 10, all in poetry.

a) *Ne . . neve* (neu) = 8 (with 2 vbs., exc. Verg. Aen. 12. 72): Verg. A. 2. 607; 6. 833; 7. 97; 202 (*neve*), 9. 114 (*neve*), 12. 72 (*neve*), 566 *ne qua esto neu quis ito*; Ovid Met. 10. 352 (*neve*).

b) *ne . . nec* = 2: Ovid Met. 3. 116; 7. 507.

SILVER LATIN = 4, all in poetry.

a) *ne . . neve* (neu) = 3 (neu = o): Sen. Phoen. 556, Thy. 94, Stat. Theb. 5. 670. (This construction is found 8 times in two official documents in Livy 38. 11 and 38. 38.)

b) *ne . . nec* = 1: Stat. Silv. 5. 1. 180 *ne concute nec crucia*.

G. *NE . . NEVE . . NEVE* = 0, AND *NE . . NEC . . NEC* = 1.

Ovid Am. 1. 76. 3 *ne dubita nec oculis nec capillis parce*. (Cf. Cic. Verr. 1. 143 *ne admittito neve dato neve redimito*, and Leg. 3. 11, both in laws. Cf. also C. I. L., XI, 4766 *nequis violatod neque evehito neque exferito*.)

H. *NEC* AND *NEVE* (NEU) = 3, IN POETRY.

Ovid A. A. 2. 334 *sit modus! Neve prohibe nec porrige*; A. A. 3. 755 *carpe nec perungue neve praesume*; and Sil. 2. 700 *audite neu rumpite nec postferite*. Cf. Apul. Met. 8. 8 (p. 183. 14). Compare their use with the subjunctive, p. 273, and see E, *supra*, 2. b, 2 on Tib. 1. 1. 38.

I. *ET NE*, *AC NE*, ETC.

Et ne was used by Verg., Val. Fl. and Stat. once each; *ac ne* 5 times: Plaut., Sil. (2), Val. Fl., Stat.; —*que ne* once: Val. Fl. 4. 125. Cf. pp. 256 f.

SUMMARY: THE IMPERATIVE.

A tabular form of presentation has been adopted for the purpose of showing with clearness the exact usage of each period, the kind of connective that was selected, and the extent of its

use (a doubled negative and the use of both *nec* and *neu* in the same sentence were excluded).

A) POSITIVE.

Periods.	Prose.				Poetry.				Total
	neve	neu	neque	nec	neve	neu	neque	nec	
Early Latin.....	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
Classical Latin.....	0	0	0	1	18	5	3	79	106
Silver Latin.....	0	0	0	1	8	5	0	22	36
Total.....	0	0	0	2	26	11	4	103	146

B) AFTER NE.

Periods.	Prose.				Poetry.				Total
	neve	neu	neque	nec	neve	neu	neque	nec	
Early Latin.....	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3
Classical Latin.....	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	2	10
Silver Latin.....	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4
Total.....	1	0	1	0	7	5	0	3	17

NOTES.

a) *Positive*:

1) This usage is more common in poetry (144) than in prose (2).

2) *Neque* (nec) was used more often than *neve* (neu) in every period. In early Latin the difference is only slight, 3-1, but in Classical Latin it becomes more marked, 83-23, and in the Silver Age it is 23-13.

3) In prose, *neve* (neu) was not used at all, *nec* only once by Cicero and once by Seneca, one the stylist of the Classical period, the other the stylist of the Silver Age.

4) In poetry, both connectives were used, but with this difference: with *neve* the longer form was preferred (26-11), but with *neque*, the shorter (103-4). In fact, in the Silver Age, *nec* alone was used, in both prose and poetry. Cf. under pres. subj. p. 275.

5) Certain forms of expression were only found in poetry: the use of *neve* (neu) and of *neque* (nec) after a period, or after an indic. or subj., or with the particle repeated, and the use of *nec* . . *neu*. Cf. p. 262 f.

As in poetry *neque* (*nec*) was used 107 times to *neve* (*neu*) only 37 times, the question arises, what part did metrical considerations play in the selection of the particle? Are we to look to the metre as an explanation for the fact that the classical poets used *neque* (*nec*) almost three times as often as *neve* (*neu*) to connect two imperatives (57-20)? In seeking for an answer to this question the following facts are to be considered. In the three passages where *neque* was used (Ovid Tr. 5. 6. 46, Pont. 2. 7. 84; Hor. C. 3. 7. 29) it was used before a vowel, a condition of affairs permitting the use of *nec*,¹ had that form been desired, but precluding the use of *nēve* or *neu*, as *neu* was avoided before a vowel (cf. Lease, Class. Phil. III, p. 306). Metrical convenience, therefore, may have decided the use of *neque* (or *nec*) in these three passages. With *nec*, however, the particle in most general use, the situation is different. In all the uses of the imperative *nec* was used 73 times before a consonant (in Ovid 63, Verg. 4, Hor. 1, Prop. 3, Tib. 2), and hence there was nothing in the metre to prevent the use of *neu*, had the poet desired to use that connective, but in the 6 passages where *nec* was used before a vowel (Ovid Her. 11. 60, A. A. 1. 440; 3. 756, Tr. 1. 9. 65, Pont. 1. 9. 24, Fast. 4. 5. 26) *neque* could, of course, be used, but neither *nēve* nor *neu*. It is evident from the above that metrical considerations *may* have had some influence in determining the particular connective used, when before a vowel, i. e. only 9 times out of a total 82, and not in the vast majority of cases. A similar conclusion was reached regarding the preference for *neque* (*nec*) with a pres. or perf. subj. Note the use of *neque* before a cons., Hor. S., 1. 10. 73, before a vowel, Ovid A. A. 2. 226; 3. 468, Tr. 3. 4. 77, but, on the contrary, before a cons., with a permissible *neu*, 92 times. Cf. Part II. Hence, with the imperative and subj. pres. and perf., the metre could have influenced the use of *neque* (*nec*) only in 11 cases at the most, but in 168 the poet used this connective from preference.

Though the facts of literary usage are so overwhelmingly in favor of the use of *neque* (*nec*), it is to be noted that in official

¹ Both Ovid and Horace, as also the rest of the Augustan poets, occasionally use *nec* before a vowel. Vergil, in his Eclogues, uses *nec* thus but once (6. 2), in his Georg., once (*h*, G. 4. 216). Horace, only 3 times (C. 2. 9. 4; 15; *h*, Sat. 1. 9. 31). Catullus shows only two examples, 43. 3 and before *h*, 10. 21, but Ovid and Tibullus use it more freely.

documents, as laws, decrees of the senate, etc., there is a decided preference for the use of *neve* (neu). In the *C. I. L.*, Vol. I, in the *Sen. Cons.* of 59-44 B. C. (Kübler, *Caes.* III, 2), in the laws to 11 B. C., quoted by Bruns, *Fontes Iur. Rom*⁶, the only connective used with the imper. and subj. was *neve*, and that too, in both positive and negative sentences. So also for the most part in the laws quoted by Cicero (*Verr.* I. 143, *De Leg.*). But, though in the legal style the prevailing particle was *neve*, *neque* was sometimes used, as in *Cic. Leg.* 3. 6; 11; and 2. 19. Cf. also the formula for the *Ver Sacrum*, *Livy* 22. 105, and in treaties before 188 B. C., quoted by *Livy* 38. 11 and 38. Cf. further Bennett, *Early Lat.* I, pp. 173, 364.

The use of the imperative in *Oratio Obliqua* is also entitled to consideration.

Neve (neu) was thus used by *Caes.* B. C. 3. 16. 5, the author of *Bell. Alex.* 34. 2, by *Curt.* 3. 8. 2, *Tac. Ann.* 1. 44; 2. 72; 2. 83; 16. 10, *Hist.* 2. 48 (bis), *Frontin.* 47. 42; but *neque* (nec) by *Nepos Them.* 6. 5, *Livy* 21. 22, 6; 9, *Curt.* 5. 13. 5. Note also the use in *parataxis*: *Caes.* 5. 58. 4 *neu*, *Sall. Cat.* 33. 5; 58. 21, *Or. Ph.* 16, *Tac. Ann.* 15. 63, *Frontin.* 4. 7. 42, all with *neve*; but *neque* (nec) in *Cic. N. D.* 3. 12, *Livy* 44. 36. 11; 30. 37. 3; *Tac. Ann.* 6. 12, *Verg. A.* 11. 444, *Prop.* 1. 4. 28; with both *nec* and *neu*, *Livy* 25. 9. 4.

b) After *ne*: excluding the only two passages in prose, one with *neque*, one with *neve*, in Cato, the usage of the poets is decisive for the use of *neve* (*neu*) after *ne* (12-3).

CONCLUSION.

The use of *nēque* and *nēve* is to be accounted for by the fact that there were two particles serving as their base, *nē* and *nē̄*. As *nē* is the original negative,¹ it follows that *nēque*, and not *nēve*, was the original connective. The fact that in *I. E.* *nē* was used with the subj. and opt., that in Oscan *neþ* (i. e. *neque*) was used in prohibitions (cf. Buck, *Gram. Osc. and Umbr.* 313 and *A. J. P.* XXII, p. 91), also points to the primitive use of *neque* in Early Latin. In the literature of this period only *neque* (nec) is used to connect two imperatives, and with the pres. subj. it is used about four times as often as *neve* (neu), and is almost exclusively used with the perf. subj. (Part II); cf. p. 275

¹ Cf. Kühner, *Ausführl. Gram.* II², p. 817 and Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*,⁴ p. 203

note 4. At the time, however, that *nē* began to be regarded as the appropriate negative with the imperative, the feeling could easily arise that the logical continuative with that mood would be *et ne* (cf. p. 256), or a compound of *nē* of similar force. As *nēve* was the only compound to hand, it was pressed into service, though strictly a disjunctive, and not a conjunctive, particle. The intruder, however, was not accorded a general welcome. It would seem, judging by popular usage, that the need was generally felt for a purely conjunctive particle. As *neque* met this requirement, it was retained and found general acceptance, while *neve* was restricted to the legal and more formal style. It is significant that in prose the imperative is only connected by *nec*, that with the pres. subj. *neve* was not used until the Silver Age and then only twice, but *neque* (*nec*) was used 44 times (cf. p. 275, n. 3), and with the perf. subj. *neque* (*nec*) was used in prose 24 times, but *neve* (*neu*) not at all. For the preference for *neque* after *ut*, except in the Early Latin, cf. Part II. To the above considerations is to be added the evidence of the Romance languages, from which *neve* has disappeared without leaving a trace.

II. SUBJUNCTIVE.

The present subjunctive with *neve* or *neque* is found in the first three periods of Latin literature in 378 passages. Of these 29 occur in Early Latin, 202 in Classical Latin, and 147 in Silver Latin; in prose 70.

A. PRESENT.

a) TWO PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVES = 122.

This usage belongs chiefly to poetry, where 100 such passages are found, to 21 in prose (0-7-14). *Neve* appears first in prose in Plin. Mai., and was used but once. *Neque*, on the other hand, was used 21 times, Cic. (7), Livy, Sen. (5), Quint. (2), Q. Decl., Tac. (2), Plin. Min. (3). In poetry, both *neve* and *neque* appear in the earliest period: *neve* in Plaut., then in Verg. (2), Hor. (4) Ovid (6), Tib. (2), Calp., Val. Fl., Sil. 3; *neque* in Naev., Plaut. (3), Catull. (2), Verg. (3), Hor. (3), Tib. (4), Prop. (4), Ovid (27!), Sen. (6), Luc. (2), Val. Fl. (5), Sil. (4), Stat. (5), Mart. (9), Juv., Cato *Dist.*

Summary: in prose: *neve* = 1, *neu* = 0, *neque* 2, *nec* = 19; in poetry: *neve* = 10, *neu* = 10, *neque* = 4, *nec* = 76.

1) EARLY LATIN = 5 (all in poetry).

Neu = 1 (Plaut. Poen. 29), *neque* (nec) = 4 (Naev. Com. Fgt. 112 (nec), Plaut. Asin. 775, 784, Vid. 51 (nec).

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 64 (prose = 7).

a) *Neve* (neu) = 14 (neu = 7), prose = 0. Verg. A. 7. 265; 8. 582 (cf. 9. 216 ferat. Neu sim), Hor. C. 1. 2. 41; 51, Sat. 2. 5. 24, Ep. 1. 18. 110, Ovid Her. 1. 80; 18. 67, Met. 6. 40; 7. 520; 15. 426, Pont. 4. 88, Tib. 1. 2. 10 (cf. 1. 4. 41 cedas. Neu neges), Lygd. 3. 6. 10.

b) *Neque* (nec) = 50 (nec = 46), prose = 7. Prose: Cic. Rep. 1. 3, Sest. 143, *neque*; *nec*: Lael. 21, Off. 1. 92; 1. 134, Planc. 15, Cael. 14. Poetry: Cat. 11. 21; 68. 49, Verg. E. 8. 89, A. 4. 618; 11. 354, Hor. C. 2. 11. 4, Sat. 1. 10. 73 (*neque*), 2. 1. 44 *ut* pereat *nec* noceat, Tib. 1. 1. 9; 1. 7. 57; 1. 9. 59, 3. 4. 1, Prop. 1. 1. 36 (*neque*), 2. 18. 36; 3. 20. 29; 4. 5. 3, and in Ovid 27 times (all *nec*): Am. 1. 6. 26, Her. 6. 157; 19. 68, A. A. 1. 146, 463; 2. 325; 3. 319, Met. 6. 4, Tr. 1. 1. 11; 3. 4. 77; 4. 5. 34; 5. 3. 40, Ibis 117, 255, 261, 283, 358, 561, 609 *utque* . . *nec*, 620, 629, Pont. 3. 7. 11, Fast. 1. 688, 692; 4. 757; 5. 688, 692; 4. 757; 5. 688 (*et* . . *nec*; cf. 1. 691). For the use of *nec* in parataxis cf. p. 267.

3) SILVER LATIN = 53 (prose = 15).

a) *neve* (neu) = 6 (neu = 3), prose = 1. Plin. Mai. 19. 59 sit *neve* adimat; poetry: Calp. 4. 88 (neu), Val. Fl. 5. 240¹ (*Kr.*, neu), Sil. 2. 20 (neu), 15. 511; 17. 367 oro: patiare *neve* sinas. Cf. Tac. Hist. 3. 25 precabatur manes *neve* se aversarentur.

b) *neque* (nec) = 47. Only *nec* is used. Prose = 14: Livy 44. 36. 11 (21. 41. 6 = *nec* solum), Sen. Dial. 6. 6. 3; 8. 5. 7 (*licet*), Ep. 15. 8; 17. 9; 99. 16 nihil . . *nec* (1. Pl.), Quint. 1. 4. 12; 8. 3. 6; Decl. 149. 6, Tac. Dial. 22, Ann. 3. 12 nemo . . *nec*, Plin. Min. 4. 16. 3; 6. 22. 7, Pan. 38. 3 (2. 2. 3 *nec di sinant* is to be regarded as a potential). Poetry = 33: Sen. H. F. 1080, H. O. 1328, Thy. 29; 31, Oed. 676, [Oct. 276 *utinam*], Luc. 2. 343; 5. 576, Val. Fl. 1. 799; 5. 648; 678; 7. 482; 8. 395; Sil. 2. 301; 9. 348; 475; 16. 260, Stat. Silv. 1. 106; 5. 2. 88, Theb. 3. 373; 11. 623; 704, Mart. Sp. 11. 4; 1. pr.; 1. 35. 14; 7. 72. 11; 9. 42. 4; 58. 4; 10. 33. 7; 78. 15; 12. 14. 2, Juv. 12. 130, Cato Dist. 30. Note: Val. Fl. 7. 182 *deveniat*. *Nec* subeat metus *aut ne* time; Mart. 13. 126 unguentum *numquam nec* vina relinquo.

¹ Langen Val. Flacc., 5. 240 reads *ne*.

b) AFTER A PERIOD = 80 (prose = 17).

After a period *neve* was used only by Ovid¹ (*neve* = 12, *neu* = 2), *neque* only by Plaut., Enn. and Cic.; in all *neque* = 3, *nec* = 63. This usage is found chiefly in poetry, 63 times (*neque* = 2, *nec* 47 (0-28-19) and in Ovid, *neve* = 12, *neu* = 2), with only 17 in prose, *neque* 1, *nec* (0-2-14). In prose *nec* begins with Cic. (2), and is later found in Sen. (2), Quint. (6), Tac. (3), Apul. (3). In poetry, *neque* was only used twice, in Early Latin (Plaut., Enn.), *nec* being used thereafter (47); Verg., Prop. (2), Tib. (3), Ovid (22), Sen. (2), Pers., Lucan, Val. Fl. (2), Sil., Stat., Mart. (7), Juv. (4). Compare the use of *Ac ne* and *Et ne*, p. 256 f.

1) EARLY LATIN = 2 (*neque*).

Plaut. 605 *Neque creduis*; Enn. Trag. Frg. 363 *Neque extollas*.

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 44 (prose = 3).

a) *Neve* (*neu*) = 14 (*neu* = 2), found only in Ovid: 1st. Pers.: Met. 7. 520; 13. 306; (after a semicolon, Her. 18. 67, *neu*); 2d Pers.: Met. 14. 32 (*neu*), 131 (*neu*), 464, Trist. 2. 421; 5. 8. 21, Ibis 481. 485, Pont. 2. 9. 73; 3d Pers. Met. 11. 430; 14. 16, Ibis 93. 361 (cf. Verg. G. 2. 299).

b) *Neque* (*nec*) = 30. All *nec* except one. Prose = 3. Prose: Cic. De Or. 3. 191 *Neque conturbet Rep.* 4. 6 *Nec praeponatur*, Off. 1. 2 *Nec velim*; poetry = 27: Verg. E. 2. 34, Tib. 1. 6. 75; 3. 12. 11, Lygd. 3. 6. 45, Prop. 1. 9. 25; 4. 6. 47 (in parenthesis: Verg. E. 9. 6; 10. 46), and in Ovid 21 times: Am. 1. 11. 26, Her. 6. 157; 16. 83, A. A. 1. 135; 2. 121; 333, Rem. 243. 352 (in parenthesis), Ibis 255. 261. 275. 297, 303. 349. 493. 561. 629 (9 in Ibis alone!), Pont. 1. 8. 59, Fast. 4. 63; 100; 151. Note Ovid Her. 16. 83 *risit "nec te tangant"* and Cic. De Or. 3. 48 *Praetereamus Neque commoremur*.

3) SILVER LATIN = 34. Only *nec* is used. Prose = 14. Prose: Sen. Dial. 9. 10. 5, Ep. 116. 6 (both 3d Pers.), Quint. 2. 17. 10; 3. 6. 101; 4. 2. 34; 8. 4. 12; 10. 7. 18; 11. 1. 13 (all 3d Pers., exc. the last, and all = *nec quisquam* exc. the first and last), Tac. Dial. 32. 1, Hist. 1. 84; 2. 47, Apul. Met. 54. 8 *nec putetis*, and 69. 23; 142. 20 *nec putes* (cf. *nec . . neu*, p. 273). Poetry (20): Sen. Thy. 677, H. O. 848 (3. Per.), Pers. 5. 157 (2. Per.). Luc. 10. 375 (3. P.). Cf. also 7. 320, cited on p. 259. Val. Fl. 4. 124; 7. 182 (3. P.), Sil. 6. 484, Stat. Silv. 1. 1. 17, Mart. Sp. 5. 3; 1. 70. 7; 4. 20. 2 (*bis*), 9. 26. 7; 10. 5.

¹ In Hor. Ep, 1. 13. 16 the text has been changed.

13; 1. 117. 13 *pete*. *Nec* *roges*; Juv. 12. 93 and possibly 3. 302; 8. 188; 9. 99. (After a semicolon: Tac. Ann. 3. 50, Sen. H. O. 759, Stat. Theb. 11. 711; after a question, Sen. N. Q. 7. 30. 2 *nec miremur*.) Cf. p. 263, l. 2.

Note: *neque enim* *sinant*, Tac. Ann. 1. 43 and compare the use of this combination with a perf. subj., Part II.

c) AFTER AN IMPERATIVE = 63 (prose = 6, Apul.).

In this usage *neque* was not used at all, *nec* on the contrary is found 47 times. In prose, only *nec* was used (6), but in poetry *neve* 8 times (0-7-1), *neu* 8 (0-6-2), and *nec* 41 times (1-29-11). In prose this construction was only used by Apul. (6), in poetry, *neve* (*neu*) appears first in Cicero, then in Verg. (2), Ovid (7), Tib. (3), Sen., Stat., Cato, *nec* first in Plaut., then Verg., Hor., Tib. (3), Prop. (2), Ovid (22!), Sen., Pers. (2), Luc., Calp. (2), Val. Fl., Stat. (4).

1) EARLY LATIN = 1 (*nec*), poetry. Plaut. Amph. 985 *discede*: *nec quisquam fuat*. (cf. Truc. 787, text).

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 42, poetry.

a) *Neve* (*neu*) = 13 (*neu* = 6). Cic. Frg. 30. 20 (B.) *usurpa neu superet*, Verg. G. 2. 37 (*neu*), A. 9. 233, Ovid A. A. 1. 489, Met. 10. 546; 13. 472; 14. 32 (*neu*), Pont. 3. 3. 85; 3. 7. 30, Trist. 1. 288, Tib. 1. 2. 3 (*neu*), 3. 12. 7 (*neu*), 1. 10. 17 *servate. Neu pudeat*.

b) *Nec* = 29 (*neque* not used). Verg. A. 12. 801, Hor. C. 3. 29. 6, Tib. 1. 4. 62; 9. 23; 3. 9. 3, Prop. 4. 5. 41; 11. 94, and in Ovid 22 times: Am. 3. 14, 16 (—to), A. A. 1. 146; 584; 2. 226; 323; 3. 468; 665, Her. 15. 55, Rem. 321. 513, Met. 8. 792; 9. 698; 14. 23; 15. 175, Trist. 1. 1. 50, Pont. 2. 3. 11; 2. 6. 14; 3. 7. 11, Fast. 1. 680; 2. 506; 4. 755; 6. 778. Note Fast. 4. 755 da. *Nec obsit. Nec noceat*.

3) SILVER LATIN = 20 (prose = 6).

a) *Neve* (*neu*) = 3 (*neu* = 2), all in poetry. Sen. Troad. 553, *libera, Neve putes*, Stat. Theb. 3. 718 *solare neu sint*, Cato Dist. 1. 12 *fuge neu studeas*.

b) *Nec* = 17 (*neque* = 0), prose = 6 (Apul.). Apul. Met. 62. 3; 96. 6 (—to); 100. 23; 113. 10; 123. 5; 270, 18; poetry (11): Sen. H. O. 848, Pers. 3. 73; 6. 76, Luc. 4. 165, Calp. 4. 80; 5. 63, Val. Fl. 8. 103, Stat. Ach. 1. 75, Silv. 2. 2. 97; 3. 1. 110; 7. 94 da *nec . . nec . . nec*.

d) AFTER AN INDICATIVE = 6 (prose = 1, Apul.).

This usage begins in Ter., with *neque*, and was later used by Ovid (twice with *neve* (neu), once with *nec*), appearing again in Mart. with *nec*, and found only once in prose, Apul., with *neve*. Ter. Eun. 1080 stertit: neque metuas; Ovid Her. 16. 361 vici neve putes; 18. 67 deast; neu referam; Tr. 5. 2. 65 veni nec cruciet; Mart. 1. 54. 4 locum rogamus nec recuses, Apul. Phil. p. 13. 6 idoneum non est neve iuretur. Cf. p. 263.

e) NEVE (neu) . . . NEVE (neu) = 8, NEQUE (nec) . . .
NEQUE (nec) = 52.

In these combinations *neve* is used 10 times (5 in prose), *neu* 6 times (1 in prose), *neque* is used 22 times (8 in prose), *nec* 84 times (23 in prose).

Neve (neu) . . . *neve* (neu) begins in prose in Cato, and is later used by Sall. and Sen.; in poetry with Ovid (2), Hor. (2), and Tib. *Neque* (nec) . . . *neque* (nec) is used by Cic., Livy, Sen. (5), Quint. (4), Tac., Apul. (3), and by Plaut. (6), Verg. (3), Hor., Tib., Prop. (2), Ovid (17!), Mart. (4), Luc. (2).

EARLY LATIN = 7 (prose = 1).

a) *neve* . . . *neve* = 1 (Cato Agr. 143. 1).

b) In Plautus = 6; *neque* . . . *neque* = 4 (Ba. 847, Men. 221, Ps. 272, two verbs, Asin. 854 one vb.). *neque* . . . *nec* = 1 (Ba. 476), and *nec* . . . *nec* = 1 (Poen. 859).

b) CLASSICAL LATIN = 31 (*neve* = 6; *neu* = 6, *neque* = 4, *nec* = 47), prose = 1.

a) *Neve* (neu) . . . *neve* (neu) = 6. Sall. Cat. 51. 43 censeo: neu quis referat neve agat; Ovid Met. 2. 138; Fast. 4. 765 valeant. *Neve* redigam neve gemam, Hor. Sat. 2. 5. 89 adito neu desis neve abundes, A. P. 191 *Neve* . . . *neu* . . . *nec* . . . *nec*, Tib. 2. 1. 19 pellite neu eludar neu timeat. Cf. 1. 6. 17 *neu* . . . *neve* . . . *neu* . . . caveto.

b) *Neque* (nec) . . . *neque* (nec) = 25 (*neque* = 2), all in poetry except one (Cic.).

(1) *Imper.* and *Subj.* = 3; Ovid Am. 1. 8. 65, Rem. 680, A. A. 2. 725 (*neque* . . . *nec*. Cf. Met. 8. 433 pone age nec intercipe nec decipiat; Fast. 4. 759 placā. Nec dryadas nec labra nec Faunum videamus; Trist. 1. 1. 5. habe. Nec (*quater*). (2) *With two subjs.* = 13 (*neque* = 1): Verg. G. 1. 37, Hor. Ep. 10. 8 (cf. A. P. 191), Tib. 1. 4. 47, Prop. 4. 5. 48, and 9 in Ovid: A. A. 1. 495, 505, 516, 521; 3. 795, Rem. 517, 639, Ibis 117, A. A. 2. 507 (*neque* . . . *nec*). Cf. Pont. 1. 2. 109 subeam nec pre-

mantur nec pulset; Fast. 1. 689 *et neque* . . *neque*, also Ibis 109, 114, A. A. 3. 443. (3) *With one subj.* = 7: Cic. Or. 196, Ovid Am. 3. 14. 21 *nec posuisse nec sustinuisse sit*, 3. 14. 24, Med. 73, A. A. 1. 621; 2. 231, Prop. 2. 18. 33. (4) *With indic. and subj.* = 2: (already found in Ter.; cf. d, *supra*) Verg. E. 10. 17 *nec paenitet nec paeniteat*, G. 1. 36 *nec sperant nec veniat*. Note also *nec* . . *nec* . . *nec* . . *nec* in Prop. 2. 13. 19.

3) SILVER LATIN = 22 (*neve* = 2, *neque* = 8, *nec* = 37).

a) *neve* . . *neve* = 1. Sen. Ep. 7. 8 *neve similis fias neve inimicus*.¹

b) *neque* (*nec*) . . *neque* (*nec*) = 21 (poetry = 6). Prose, *nec* . . *nec* = 5 (Sen. Ep. 40. 3, Quint. 2. 2. 5; 8. 2. 14, Tac. Dial. 13 (1. P.), Apul. Met. 146, 6 (2. P.); *nec* . . *nec* . . *nec* = 1 (Quint. 1. 11. 2); *neque* . . *neque* = 2 (Livy 22. 39. 22, Quint. 8. 2. 22); *neque* . . *nec* = 2 (Apul. 106. 20; 137. 8), but with one main verb = 5 (*nec* . . *nec*: Livy 28. 43. 8, Sen. Dial. 5. 72; 9. 13. 1; *neque* . . *neque*, Sen. Ep. 96. 4, *nec* (4 times), Sen. Ep. 116. 5). Poetry: *nec* . . *nec*, one verb: Mart. 13. 10. 1, two verbs: Mart. Sp. 1. 2; 10. 70. 11; 11. 99. 8, Lucan. 1. 94 *nec credite nec petantur*, 2. 637 *concute*. *Nec relinquo nec feras*. Cf. Sil. 11. 400 *comibat nec pudeat nec pugnet*, Plin. Mai. 16. 178 *nec* . . *nec* . . *neque* . . *aut*, Apul. 112. 10 *neque conferas et respondeas*. In prose: *neque* = 8, *nec* = 23; in poetry: *neque* = 0, *nec* = 12. (Fronto p. 96 (N.) also has *nec* . . *nec*).

f) *NEC* . . *NEVE* (*neu*) = 8, (prose = 2, Apul.).

This usage is found in prose only in Apul., but in poetry 6 times (Prop., Ov. (3), Juv., Petron.).

Prose: Apul. Met., 183. 14 *maritare, modo ne convenias neve conferas nec accumbas nec adquiescas*; 158. 8 *nec putetis neve aestimetis*. Poetry: Prop. 1. 8. 9 *utinam* . . *nec* . . *neve*; Ovid Rem. 628, Met. 8. 709 (*neu*), Tr. 1. 1. 13 (cf. Verg. G. 3. 435, latest texts²), Juv. 14. 201 (*neu*), Petron. 4. 5 *nec* . . *nec* . . *neve*. For the corresponding use with the imperative cf. p. 264.

g) *NE* . . *NEVE* (*neu*) = 23, *NE* . . *NEQUE* (*nec*) = 9.

Ne . . *neve* (*neu*) was used in prose 8 times (Cato (4), Cic., Cels., Plin. Mai. (2)), in poetry 15 times (Plaut., Lucr., Cat. Verg. (3), Hor., Ovid (4), Sil., Stat. (2), Mart.); *ne* . . *neque* (*nec*) was

¹ O. Hense, Sen. Epist. 123. 7 quotes Joehring: "*neve apud Senecam nusquam inveni*". Cf. also Troad. 553 *neve putes*.

² Schmalz Synt.⁴ p. 247 cites Verg. for this usage.

found in prose once (Vitruv.), in poetry 8 times (Plaut. (3), Ter. (2), Sen. (3)).

1) EARLY LATIN = 10 (prose = 4).

a) *ne* . . *neve* (neu) = 5 (neu = 1): Cato Agr. 5. 4 (neu); 8. 3; 143. 1 (bis), Plaut. Poen. 38.

b) *ne* . . *neque* (nec) = 5 (nec = 0) in poetry: Plaut. Asin. 778, Capt. 437 (ne) *deseras neque des*; Vid. 53, Ter. And. 205, Eun. 77.

2) CLASSICAL LATIN = 12 (prose = 2).

a) *ne* . . *neve* (neu) = 11 (neu = 3): Cic. Leg. 2. 64, Lucr. 4. 39, Catull. 61. 126 (nec *v. l.*), Verg. G. 1. 80; 2. 253 (neu); 3. 435 (neu), Hor. Ep. 16. 27 (neu), Ovid Her. 10. 90, Met. 7. 529; 13. 135, Tr. 5. 6. 8. Cf. Cic. Or. 29 *sit aut ne sit* . . . *neve*.

b) *ne* . . *neque* (nec) = 1: Vitruv. 1. 1. 7 *ne sit neque habeat*. Cf. Cic. Leg. 2. 60.

3) SILVER LATIN = 10 (prose = 3).

a) *ne* . . *neve* (neu) = 7: Celsus 362. 26, Plin. Mai. 17. 107; 18. 328, all *neve*. Poetry: Sil. 17. 381, Mart. 4. 19. 10, and *neu*: Stat. Theb. 3. 240; 11. 133.

b) *ne* . . *nec* = 3: Sen. Thy. 134. 749, H. O. 1328.

h) NE . . NEVE . . NEVE and NE . . NEQUE . . NEQUE = 6.

The former = 3: Plaut. Poen. 18 (neu = *ter*), (cf. C. I. L., I 119. 10 *ni* . . *nive* . . *nive*), Lucr. 2. 415 *ne* . . *neu* . . *neve*, Hor. C. 1. 36. 10 (neu = *sex*.) *ne* . . . *neque* . . . *neque*; Plaut. Asin. 785 f., *ne* . . *nec* . . *nec* = 2: Plaut. Asin. 799, Lucan 2. 260.

i) ET NE, AC NE, etc.

For these usages cf. p. 256 f.; for *et non*, *que non*, *ac non* and *non* . . . *nec* cf. p. 258 f. For *neque enim* cf. p. 271.

SUMMARY: PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE (excluding negative doubled, and *nec* . . . *neu*).

A) POSITIVE.

Periods.	Prose.				Poetry.				
	<i>neve</i>	<i>neu</i>	<i>neque</i>	<i>nec</i>	<i>neve</i>	<i>neu</i>	<i>neque</i>	<i>nec</i>	Total
Early Latin	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	9
Classical Latin	0	0	3	7	27	16	2	98	153
Silver Latin	2	0	0	34	3	5	0	65	109
Total	2	0	3	41	30	22	7	166	271

B) NEGATIVE.

Periods.	Prose.				Poetry.				Total
	neve	neu	neque	nec	neve	neu	neque	nec	
Early Latin	3	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	10
Classical Latin	1	0	1	0	6	4	0	0	12
Silver Latin.....	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	10
Total.....	7	1	1	0	9	6	5	3	32

NOTES.

a) *Positive.*

1) With *neve* the longer form is more common (32-22); with *neque* the shorter (207-10). In Early Latin *neque* outnumbers *nec*, but in Class. Lat. is only used 5 times to *nec* 105 times, while in Silver Latin *neque* was not used at all, *nec* 99. This preference for *nec* was in accordance with the general tendency. Cf. pp. 261 and 265, n. 4. In fact, *nec* was not only the only form used in Silver Latin with the pres. subj., but it was also the only form used after an imperative (cf. p. 271 c.), after a period (exc. in Early Lat.), and in the formula *nec . . neu*.

2) These constructions were much more common in poetry (225) than in prose (46).

3) *Neve* (*neu*) appears first in prose in Plin. Mai. and later in Apul. Note prose usage: *neve* = 2, *neque* (*nec*) = 44.

4) In every period *neque* (*nec*) was used more often than *neve* (*neu*): 8-1, then 110-43, and in Silver Latin 99-10. Note that in Class. prose *neque* (*nec*) was used 8 times, but *neve* (*neu*) not at all. Compare the discussion under the imperative, p. 267.

b) After *ne*: 1) prose usage is emphatic for the use of *neve* (*neu*), 8-1, the only occurrence of *neque* being in Vitruvius. So also in Class. Lat. *neve* (*neu*) is more common (11-1).

2) Of the 9 occurrences of *ne . . neque* (*nec*) 8 are in poetry. In fact in principal clauses *ne . . neque* (*nec*) was found only 3 times in prose, with the imperative (Cato), with the pres. subj. (Vitruv.), and with the perf. subj. (Sen.), but in poetry 13 times. In subordinate clauses, however, this formula is more common in prose, but in both is rare compared with *ne . . neve*.

EMORY B. LEASE.

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

[To be completed in the next number.]